



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

more suitable than *gens* in speaking of so very "ancient" a family, the origin of which went back to a time before the Roman *gentes* were thought of.

There is certainly no trace in Suetonius of the use of *stirps* as a subdivision of a *gens*. I should be inclined to add that there is no evidence for the use of *gens*, *stirps*, or any other word as the exact equivalent of *gens* or *familia*.

Another word which should be included in the last class is *imagines*; see *Calig.* 23.1, "suscensebatque si qui vel oratione vel carmine imaginibus eum [= Agrippam] Caesarum insereret," and cf. *Cic. Leg. Agr.* 2. 100.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

### CATULLUS 95

Smyrna mei Cinnae nonam post denique messem  
 quam coepta est nonamque edita post hiemem,  
 millia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno

. . . . .  
 Smyrna cavas Satrachi penitus mittetur ad undas,  
 Smyrnam cana diu saecula peruoluent.  
 at Volusi annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam  
 et laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas.  
 parua mei mihi sint cordi monimenta . . . . ,  
 at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho.

The appearance of the name "Hortensius" (Munro calls it the "absurd Hortensius") in l. 3 of this poem has caused commentators much trouble. The evidence adduced to show that it is out of place may be divided into two classes, external and internal. It is principally with the internal evidence that I am concerned.

The chief argument from internal evidence is that the unity and balance of the poem are destroyed when the name of Hortensius is introduced. Ellis (*Commentary*, p. 470) says: "No one has stated this difficulty so clearly as Fröhlich: 'If both halves of the poem form a single whole the same two poets must be mentioned in either half: if Cinna and Hortensius in the first, then Cinna and Hortensius in the second; and conversely if Cinna and Volusius in the second, then Cinna and Volusius in the first. To bring together *three* writers, as our epigram does, would produce a poem comparable with a syllogism of four terms,' p. 276." Schwabe (*Quaestiones Catullianae*, p. 282) states the difficulty as follows: "Quis enim tantam inuenustatem Catullo imputare potest ut poetam, postea quam in carminis parte priore primum Zmyrnae Hortensii et Tanusii carmina mala opposuerit, in fine vim totius carminis comprehensurum Hortensii oblitum Tanusii solius mentionem fecisse credat?" It is, then, the opinion of many commentators that the third and fourth lines should have reference to Volusius and to him alone (Schwabe

identifying Volusius with one Tanusius mentioned by Seneca *Epist.* 93. 9). Fröhlich, Schwabe, Schmidt, Baehrens, and Munro all declare "Hortensius" to be a corrupted reading.

The difficulties raised by these scholars disappear when we grasp the plan of Catullus' poem. The epigram is written in praise of the "Smyrna," a carefully elaborated poem adhering closely to the canons of the Alexandrian School, written by Catullus' friend, C. Helvius Cinna. That the main purpose of the epigram is to praise the poem of Cinna rather than to ridicule the works of Hortensius and Volusius is evidenced by the use of the word "Smyrna" at the very beginning and by its anaphoric repetition in ll. 5 and 6. The epigram is built upon antithesis, as is the case with so many of Catullus' epigrams (e.g., cc. 70, 91, 97, 103, 105). In the first distich Catullus tells how the poem of Cinna has finally appeared after nine long years of careful workmanship. Then, in the second distich, by way of contrast he tells about Hortensius, who writes a large number of wretched verses in a very short time. Catullus now begins the second half of the poem by again singing the praises of the "Smyrna": it shall be known the world over; the "centuries grown old" shall thumb its pages. Again in contrast, the poet introduces in the fourth distich the name of another poetaster who cares more for quantity than quality, Volusius. We see how admirably the antithesis is maintained: the "Smyrna" shall travel to the distant waters of the Satrachus (the home of its heroine), but Volusius' "Annals" shall go no farther than the banks of the Padua (the home of their author); the "Smyrna" shall be read forever, but the fate of the "Annals" shall be to supply wrappers for mackerel.

The main part of the epigram ends with l. 8. The final distich is devoted to a formal conclusion, and here we see the wonderful art of the poet in binding together the parts of the poem. In l. 9 he reverts to the poem of Cinna, thereby connecting the first and third distichs. In l. 10 he reverts to the careless and voluminous writers, binding together the second and fourth distichs, uniting the names of Hortensius and Volusius under that of the Greek poet Antimachus. I cannot understand why commentators should maintain that in mentioning Antimachus the poet means Volusius alone. Why Volusius more than Hortensius? Is this not the whole explanation of the use of the name of the Greek poet? Catullus wishes to use the name of a poet in the concluding distich which will typify not merely Volusius, but both Volusius and Hortensius; not merely Volusius and Hortensius, but all poets of their class. Antimachus, then, is mentioned here to represent the general type, of which Hortensius and Volusius are individual representatives. In choosing a poet to represent this type it is natural that Catullus should select one of foreign birth, and one whose fame was far greater than that of the two individuals whom he mentions. And, in spite of Quintilian's statement that the *grammatici* commonly gave Antimachus second place among epic poets (Quint. x. 1. 53), is it strange that Catullus, adhering to the prin-

ciples of Alexandrianism, should choose this author of the "Lyde," the *παχὸν γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν* (Call. frg. 74*b*, Schneider), and of the "Thebaid," "magnum illud volumen" (Cic. *Brut.* 51), as the arch-violator of the canon *τὸ μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ*? In view of the interpretation I have endeavored to give, the epigram, far from losing emphasis and unity by the introduction of the names of the two poets, Volusius and Hortensius, actually gains thereby, for the *single* work of Cinna is contrasted with the *whole class* of poetry as represented by these writers.

It is, of course, impossible to supply the missing line, but surely the suggestion of Fröhlich, which Baerhens rejects so positively, must express the sense: "versiculorum anno quolibet ediderit." Ellis suggests that this is not the only way of bringing in the name of Hortensius. He says: "We might suppose Hortensius to be introduced as the *patron* of Volusius, condemned in a single month to read 500,000 verses of Volusius' inditing.

Millia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno  
(Mense levis quot habet carta legit Volusi)."

The introduction of Hortensius in the capacity of patron is, on the contrary, the very thing to spoil the unity of the poem, while, in view of the splendid antithesis in the second half of the poem, it seems evident that we must expect a similar antithesis in the first half, and this demands that Hortensius be represented as writing a very large number of miserable verses in a very short time, be it "uno anno," "uno mense," or "uno die."

Various editors, beginning with Achilles Statius, have maintained that the last two lines are really part of another epigram, or else constitute a complete epigram by themselves. Lachmann in his edition separates these lines, and Haupt (*Opuscula* I. 1) inclines to this view. I have not found that either of these authorities states his reason, but Munro, assuming that only Volusius is meant by "Antimacho" in l. 10, says that they reject the lines because of the inconsistency of the poet's mentioning Hortensius and Volusius in the earlier part of the epigram and then mentioning only Volusius in conclusion. B. Schmidt (*Prolegomena*, XLIV) rejects the lines on the grounds that Catullus would not say in one part of the poem (ll. 7-8) that Volusius' "Annals" will not live, and farther on make the statement that they are popular. This contention of Schmidt seems well answered by Friedrich in his note to the lines. The parallel of the modern "best-seller" as compared with the standard novels of Dickens, Thackeray, or George Eliot seems so evident as scarcely to need mention. The whole art of the epigram would be ruined if the last two lines were rejected. So far from ruining the unity of the poem they are absolutely essential to it. The use of the final distich to embody a formal conclusion is a favorite device of the epigrammatists. It is used very cleverly by Catullus in c. 69. The first four lines state the difficulty in which Rufus finds himself: no woman will have anything to do with him. The next four lines give the reason. The concluding distich contains the remedy. L. 9 refers to ll. 5-8: Rufus must

destroy the cause of his unpopularity; l. 10 refers to ll. 1-4: or else he must cease to wonder why women avoid him. Among the many instances of this use of the concluding distich by the Greek epigrammatists I may mention Callimachus *A.P.* ix. 566, and *A.P.* xii. 102.

In conclusion, does the interpretation of the epigram as given above throw any light on the missing word at the end of l. 9? We have seen that the purpose of the epigram is to praise the *single* poem "Smyrna" of Cinna by contrasting it with voluminous and carelessly written works *in general*. We must expect, then, in this line some word which will indicate Cinna in a very personal and unequivocal manner. We do not, therefore, want the name of some Greek poet, as Munro insists. I know of nothing better than *sodalis*, the generally accepted emendation.

Possibly the external arguments do not admit of quite so good a case for "Hortensius." The chief objection is that Q. Hortensius Hortalus (for all seem agreed that the Hortensius here alluded to must be the great orator) was a writer of erotic poetry, and sympathized with the same tendencies as Catullus. Without entering into a discussion of this, I will merely mention that fact which, as far as I know, all editors save Ellis seem to ignore, viz., that Hortensius wrote "Annales" (*Vell. Paterc.* ii. 16: "Q. Hortensius in Annalibus suis rettulit"). To be sure, we do not know that these "Annales" were in verse. Must we assume, however, that the Hortensius to whom Catullus alludes is the orator? The name must have been a common one in Rome. Might this not be some obscure poetaster, whose very name would early have passed into oblivion but for this chance mention by Catullus?

RODNEY P. ROBINSON

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

#### EMENDATION OF MAXIMUS OF TYRE XVII.8

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνταῦθα διφυῇ ὁρῶ· τοῦ γὰρ νοῦ ὁ μὲν νοεῖν πέφυκεν, καὶ μὴ νοῶν· ὁ δὲ καὶ πέφυκε, καὶ νοεῖ.

Instead of διφυῇ we should probably read διπλόην ὁρῶ (cf. Plato *Sophist* 267E), "I see a crack or a line of cleavage for a logical διαίρεσις," or possibly διαφυγὴν (Plato *Politicus* 259D), which involves less change. The greater aptness in the context of the noun in itself makes the emendation plausible. But there is much more to be said for it. Throughout the chapter Maximus is imitating the Platonic method of dichotomy illustrated in the *Sophist* and *Politicus*. This has seemingly escaped the notice of Hobein, *De Maximo Tyrio quaestiones*, pp. 51-52, but is apparent from the vocabulary as well as from the actual procedure of division. διαιρούμενος . . . δέχα [cf. Plato *Sophist* 221E and *passim*]*—τὴν ἑτέραν τὴν τιμιωτέραν τέρμων ἀεὶ* [cf. *Sophist* 235C] *ἐστ' ἂν ἐφίκηται τοῦ νῦν ζητουμένου* [cf. *Phaedrus*